

Date: Fri, 7 Oct 94 04:30:11 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: List  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #480  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 7 Oct 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 480

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: Thu, 06 Oct 1994 20:05:00 EST  
From: dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill)

References<Cwtvq9.HAv@news.Hawaii.Edu> <Cx7nyw.DOM@usenet.ucs.indiana.edu>,  
<36vjgc\$eup@crcnis1.unl.edu>  
Subject: Re: Rude Digital Ops (was: Sum'tin for nut'in and chicks for free

gbrown@unlinfo.unl.edu (gregory brown) writes:

>Gene, if CW and other forms of digital share the same sub-band,  
>channelization would not be a good option. Without audio frequency  
>variation, a single channel would support only one CW QSO at a time.  
>Two zero beat signals would be nearly impossible to separate and copy.  
>  
>Normal CW operation allows several signals to happily co-exist within  
>a couple of KHz as long as they are separated by a few Hz (audio  
>freq).  
>  
>For packet-like digital modes, channelization would probably be a more  
>efficient use of the frequencies, but for CW it would be terribly  
>inefficient. It may be that, though CW and packet are both "digital"  
>modes, they really are not compatible. If the popularity of HF  
>digital continues to increase and the popularity of CW remains as high

>as it is today, we may see some band plans put into effect that  
>actually support separate sub-bands for these modes.

What about channelizing the non-CW digital and allowing the CW to find space around the other digital modes? Kind'a like filling in the unused space between. Is this a bad idea? I dunno...

I agree that CW is not a mode that lends itself to channelization, while maintaining spectral efficiency. The machine oriented digital modes may be another matter, as is FM.

Dan N8PKV

--

"The supreme power in America cannot enforce unjust laws by the sword, because the whole body of the people are armed, and constitute a force superior to any band of regular troops." - Noah Webster

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #480

\*\*\*\*\*